

**ADVANCED NEURAL NETWORK HEAD MOVEMENT CLASSIFICATION FOR
HANDS-FREE CONTROL OF POWERED WHEELCHAIRS**

PHILIP TAYLOR

This thesis is presented as part of the requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Technology Sydney


2007

Certificate of Authorship/Originality

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Philip Taylor', is written over a horizontal line.

Acknowledgements

First, I acknowledge the contribution of my supervisor, Professor Hung T. Nguyen. Undoubtedly, this research would not have reached its current point without his support, direction and knowledge. I also acknowledge the appreciable contribution of my co-supervisor, Professor Ashley Craig.

I acknowledge my colleagues from the UTS Faculty of Engineering and the Centre for Health Technologies, in particular Rob Mitchell, Sean Williams, Van Minh Tri Nguyen, Son Nguyen, Leslie King, Bradley Skinner and Daniel Craig for their camaraderie and assistance.

I acknowledge the input, assistance and cooperation received from Dr James Middleton and the staff and patients of the Moorong Spinal Injuries Unit (Royal Rehabilitation Centre, Sydney).

Finally, yet perhaps most importantly, I acknowledge my parents, Alan and Caralyn, my sister, Kathryn, my extended family and my friends for the assistance, support and encouragement they have provided.

Tables of Contents

Chapter 1.	Introduction.....	1
1.1.	<i>Aims and contribution of this thesis</i>	3
1.2.	<i>Structure of this thesis</i>	5
1.3.	<i>Publications</i>	7
1.3.1.	Fully refereed papers.....	7
1.3.2.	Other conference papers.....	8
Chapter 2.	Literature review	9
2.1.	<i>Wheelchair control strategies for people with high level disabilities</i>	9
2.2.	<i>Hands-free powered wheelchair control strategies</i>	13
2.2.1.	Modified joystick interfaces.....	13
2.2.2.	Bioelectric input signals.....	15
2.2.3.	Eye movement.....	22
2.2.4.	Speech recognition.....	25
2.2.5.	Head position and head movement	26
2.3.	<i>Discussion</i>	35
2.4.	<i>Research objectives</i>	37
Chapter 3.	Performance of a head-movement interface for wheelchair control..	43
3.1.	<i>Prototype wheelchair control system</i>	46
3.1.1.	Sensor.....	46
3.1.2.	Pre-processing	48
3.1.3.	Classifier	49
3.1.4.	ANN training.....	53
3.1.4.1.	Delta-rule gradient descent	54
3.1.4.2.	Levenberg Marquardt.....	58
3.1.4.3.	Scaled Conjugate Gradient.....	61
3.1.5.	ANN Implementation.....	66
3.1.6.	ANN output decoding	71
3.1.7.	Control Logic	72
3.2.	<i>Assessing the performance of the prototype classifier</i>	74
3.2.1.	Background	75
3.2.2.	Selection of a metric for classifier accuracy	75
3.2.3.	Selection of a metric for classification delay	78
3.2.4.	Methodology for the measurement of delay and accuracy	79

3.2.5.	Description of results	80
3.2.6.	Discussion of results	85
Chapter 4.	Advanced head gesture classification	90
4.1.	<i>Background</i>	91
4.1.1.	Training data	91
4.1.2.	Head gestures in sensor data, classifier window and ANN input	92
4.1.3.	ANN Architecture	100
4.1.4.	Training algorithm	100
4.2.	<i>Methodology</i>	102
4.3.	<i>Procedure</i>	106
4.3.1.	Data collection procedures	106
4.3.2.	Initialisation of ANN parameters and allocation of data	108
4.3.3.	Training of artificial neural networks	110
4.3.4.	Measurement of classifier performance	111
4.3.5.	Optimisation of ANN architecture	111
4.3.6.	Evaluation of the difference between ANN training algorithms	112
4.3.7.	Evaluation of the marginal effect of training data	112
4.4.	<i>Results</i>	113
4.4.1.	Results from ANN training and testing on generic datasets	115
4.4.1.1.	ANN architecture	116
4.4.1.2.	Training algorithm	120
4.4.1.3.	Data set size	124
4.4.2.	Results on subject 8 test set	128
4.4.3.	Results on subject 9 test set	134
4.5.	<i>Discussion</i>	139
Chapter 5.	Adaptive training of head gesture classifiers	142
5.1.	<i>Head gestures by people with disabilities</i>	144
5.2.	<i>Methodology for assessing the utility of the adaptive algorithm</i>	150
5.2.1.	Algorithm for the Control training procedure	152
5.2.2.	Algorithm for the Combined Adaptive retraining procedure	152
5.2.3.	Algorithm for the Specific Adaptive retraining procedure	154
5.2.4.	Algorithm for Custom training procedure	155
5.3.	<i>Procedure for assessment of the adaptive training algorithm</i>	155
5.4.	<i>Results</i>	157
5.4.1.	Adaptive retraining using data from Subject 8 (C4)	157
5.4.2.	Adaptive retraining using data from Subject 9 (C6)	162

5.5. Discussion.....	167
Chapter 6. Conclusions.....	169
6.1. Findings.....	170
6.2. Contributions.....	171
6.3. Limitations.....	171
6.4. Future directions.....	173
References	175
Appendix A. Background on the high-level spinal cord injury.....	188
Appendix B. Artificial neural network activation functions	190
Appendix C. On alternative classifier performance metrics.....	191
Appendix D. On the selection of sample sizes	193
Appendix E. UTS Human Research Ethics Committee Approval.....	202
Appendix F. Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of experimental results	204
Appendix G. Pairwise comparison of ranks between treatments	211

Table of Figures

Figure 1 Electrode placement for electro-oculography (Barea et al. 2000).....	25
Figure 2 Anatomical reference axes – (a) anteroposterior axis; (b) mediolateral axis; (c) longitudinal axis. (Hamill & Knutzen 2003; Tordoff & Mayol 2001).....	27
Figure 3 Anatomical descriptors of head movements – (a) flexion; (b) extension; (c) hyperextension; (d) lateral flexion; (e) rotation (Hamill & Knutzen 2003; Tordoff & Mayol 2001)	27
Figure 4 System architecture of prototype control system	45
Figure 5 Non-linear adaptive filter model of an artificial neuron (Widrow & Lamengo 2002)	50
Figure 6 An example of a feedforward ANN architecture with two hidden layers (Widrow & Lamengo 2002).....	52
Figure 7 Implementation of sliding window data structure	67
Figure 8 Finite state machine translating classifier output to the control logic parameters	73
Figure 9 Example backward-nod gesture, performed by Subject 1	94
Figure 10 Example forward-nod gesture, performed by Subject 3	95
Figure 11 Example left-nod gesture, performed by Subject 2	95
Figure 12 Example right-nod gesture, performed by Subject 4	96
Figure 13 Example shake gesture, performed by Subject 5.....	96
Figure 14 Selected 2s classifier input window corresponding to forward-nod gesture in Figure 10 (Subject 3).	97
Figure 15 Selected 2s classifier input window corresponding to backward-nod gesture in Figure 9 (Subject 1).....	98
Figure 16 Selected 2s classifier input window corresponding to left-nod gesture in Figure 11 (Subject 2).....	98
Figure 17 Selected 2s classifier input window corresponding to right-nod gesture in Figure 12 (Subject 4).....	99
Figure 18 Selected 2s classifier input window corresponding to head-shake gesture in Figure 13 (Subject 5).....	99
Figure 19 Real-time classification error rate measured on validation set as the network architecture increases in size.....	117
Figure 20 Rank of real-time classification error rate measured on validation set as the network architecture increases in size.....	117
Figure 21 Time elapsed during training as the network architecture increases in size	118
Figure 22 Rank of time elapsed during training as the network architecture increases in size	119
Figure 23 Training set mean squared error at termination of training as the network architecture increases in size.....	119

Figure 24 Validation set mean squared error at termination of training as the network architecture increases in size	120
Figure 25 Real-time classification error rate on validation set for classifiers trained using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg-Marquardt ANN training algorithms.....	121
Figure 26 Rank of real-time classification error rate on validation set for classifiers trained using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg-Marquardt ANN training algorithms.....	121
Figure 27 Time elapsed during training of each classifier using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg- Marquardt ANN training algorithms.....	122
Figure 28 Rank of time elapsed during training of each classifier using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg- Marquardt ANN training algorithms	123
Figure 29 Training set mean squared error at termination of training for classifiers trained using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg-Marquardt ANN training algorithms.....	123
Figure 30 Validation set mean squared error at termination of training for classifiers trained using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg-Marquardt ANN training algorithms.....	124
Figure 31 Real-time classification error rate on validation set as size of training set is increased.....	125
Figure 32 Rank of real-time classification error rate on validation set as size of training set is increased	125
Figure 33 Time elapsed during training of each classifier as size of training set is increased.....	126
Figure 34 Rank of time elapsed during training of each classifier as size of training set is increased	127
Figure 35 Training set mean squared error at termination of training as size of training set is increased	127
Figure 36 Validation set mean squared error at termination of training as size of training set is increased	128
Figure 37 Real-time classification error rates for Subject 8 as the network architecture increases in size	129
Figure 38 Rank of the real-time classification error rates for Subject 8 as the network architecture increases in size	130
Figure 39 Real-time classification error rate on Subject 8 test set for classifiers trained using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg-Marquardt ANN training algorithms.....	131
Figure 40 Rank of real-time classification error rate on Subject 8 test set for classifiers trained using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg- Marquardt ANN training algorithms	131

Figure 41 Real-time classification error rate on Subject 8 test set as size of training set is increased	133
Figure 42 Rank of real-time classification error rate on Subject 8 test set as size of training set is increased	133
Figure 43 Real-time classification error rates for Subject 9 as the network architecture increases in size.....	135
Figure 44 Rank of real-time classification error rates for Subject 9 as the network architecture increases in size.....	135
Figure 45 Real-time classification error rate on Subject 9 test set for classifiers trained using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg-Marquardt ANN training algorithms.....	136
Figure 46 Rank of real-time classification error rate on Subject 9 test set for classifiers trained using delta rule (DR) , scaled conjugate gradient (SCG) and Levenberg- Marquardt ANN training algorithms	137
Figure 47 Real-time classification error rate on Subject 9 test set as size of training set is increased	138
Figure 48 Rank of real-time classification error rate on Subject 9 test set as size of training set is increased	138
Figure 49 Example backward nod gesture, performed by Subject 8 (C4).....	145
Figure 50 Example forward nod gesture, performed by Subject 8	146
Figure 51 Example left nod gesture, performed by Subject 8.....	146
Figure 52 Example right nod gesture, performed by Subject 8	147
Figure 53 Example shake gesture, performed by Subject 8.....	147
Figure 54 Example backward nod gesture, performed by Subject 9 (C6).....	148
Figure 55 Example foreward nod gesture, performed by Subject 9	148
Figure 56 Example left nod gesture, performed by Subject 9.....	149
Figure 57 Example right nod gesture, performed by Subject 9	149
Figure 58 Example shake gesture, performed by Subject 9.....	150
Figure 59 Real-time classification error rate on validation set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 8 and control treatments.....	158
Figure 60 Rank of real-time classification error rate on validation set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 8 and control treatments	159
Figure 61 Real-time classification error rate on Subject 8 test set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 8 and control treatments	160
Figure 62 Rank of real-time classification error rate on Subject 8 test set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 8 and control treatments	160
Figure 63 Real-time classification error rate on Subject 9 test set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 8 and control treatments	161
Figure 64 Rank of real-time classification error rate on Subject 9 test set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 8 and control treatments	162
Figure 65 Real-time classification error rate on validation set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 9 and control treatments.....	163

Figure 66 Rank of real-time classification error rate on validation set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 9 and control treatments	163
Figure 67 Real-time classification error rate on Subject 8 test set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 9 and control treatments	164
Figure 68 Rank of real-time classification error rate on Subject 8 test set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 9 and control treatments	165
Figure 69 Real-time classification error rate on Subject 9 test set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 9 and control treatments	166
Figure 70 Rank of real-time classification error rate on Subject 9 test set for classifiers adapted using data from Subject 9 and control treatments	166
Figure 71 Approximate mapping of level of injury to remaining function (<i>Spinal Cord Injury: Facts and Figures at a Glance</i> . 2004)	189
Figure 72 Variance and Standard Error caused by sampling, where a) $p = 0.85$, b) $p = 0.9$, c) $p = 0.95$, as estimated by Equation 51	194
Figure 73 Difference detectable for given sample size (number of classifier pairs), estimated by Equation 54, where $\alpha = 0.05$, $\beta = 0.05$ and a) $\sigma^2 = 0.01$, b) $\sigma^2 = 0.05$, c) $\sigma^2 = 0.1$, d) $\sigma^2 = 0.2$	197
Figure 74 Difference detectable for given sample size (number of classifier pairs), estimated by Equation 54, where $\alpha = 0.05$, $\beta = 0.10$ and a) $\sigma^2 = 0.01$, b) $\sigma^2 = 0.05$, c) $\sigma^2 = 0.1$, d) $\sigma^2 = 0.2$	198
Figure 75 Difference detectable for given sample size (number of classifier pairs), estimated by Equation 54, where $\alpha = 0.10$, $\beta = 0.50$ and a) $\sigma^2 = 0.01$, b) $\sigma^2 = 0.05$, c) $\sigma^2 = 0.1$, d) $\sigma^2 = 0.2$	198
Figure 76 Estimates of the number of classifier pairs required for the testing of means for $\alpha = 0.05$, $\beta = 0.05$, $\sigma^2 = 0.1$ and mean accuracy a) 0.9, b) 0.925, c) 0.95, d) 0.975, e) 1.0, estimated by Equation 54	199
Figure 77 Estimates of the number of classifier pairs required for the testing of means for $\alpha = 0.05$, $\beta = 0.10$, $\sigma^2 = 0.1$ and mean accuracy a) 0.9, b) 0.925, c) 0.95, d) 0.975, e) 1.0, estimated by Equation 54	199
Figure 78 Estimates of the number of classifier pairs required for the testing of means for $\alpha = 0.10$, $\beta = 0.50$, $\sigma^2 = 0.1$ and mean accuracy a) 0.9, b) 0.925, c) 0.95, d) 0.975, e) 1.0, estimated by Equation 54	200

Table of Tables

Table 1 Terminology used throughout this thesis	16
Table 2 General form of a contingency table for a binary classifier.....	77
Table 3 General form of a multi-class contingency table.	78
Table 4 Confusion matrix for real-time classification of gestures performed by able-bodied subjects, with graphical feedback	81
Table 5 Confusion matrix for real-time classification of gestures performed by able-bodied subjects, without graphical feedback	82
Table 6 Confusion matrix for real-time classification of gestures performed by disabled subjects, with graphical feedback	82
Table 7 Confusion matrix for real-time classification of gestures performed by disabled subjects, without graphical feedback	83
Table 8 Confusion matrix for real-time classification of all gestures performed by able-bodied subjects	83
Table 9 Confusion matrix for real-time classification of all gestures performed by disabled subjects	84
Table 10 Sensitivity, specificity and error rate of the artificial neural network, averaged for the 4 possible classifications.	84
Table 11 Mean (Standard deviation) of the delay (ms) between movement and classification.....	85
Table 12 Summary of subjects providing gesture data	107
Table 13 Composition of training, validation and test sets for experiments in Chapter 4.....	110
Table 14 Rank of validation set classifier error rate using best performing treatments	115
Table 15 Size of datasets for control and adaptive retraining procedures.	156
Table 16 Rank of adapted classifier error rates on user specific test sets	157
Table 17 Friedman's 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the validation set real-time classification error rate as network architecture increases in size	204
Table 18 Friedman's 2-way analysis of variance by ranks on the training time as network architecture increases in size.....	204
Table 19 Friedman's 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the validation set real-time classification error rate for ANN trained with different algorithms	205
Table 20 Friedman's 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the training time of ANN classifiers trained with different algorithms	205
Table 21 Friedman's 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the validation set real-time classification error rate as training set increases in size	205
Table 22 Friedman's 2-way analysis of variance by ranks on the training time of ANN classifiers as training set increases in size.....	206
Table 23 Friedman's 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate as network architecture increases in size	206

Table 24 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate for ANN trained with different algorithms.	206
Table 25 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate as training set increases in size	207
Table 26 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate as network architecture increases in size	207
Table 27 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate for ANN trained with different algorithms.	207
Table 28 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate as training set increases in size	208
Table 29 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the validation set real- time classification error rate for classifiers retrained with user specific data from Subject 8.....	208
Table 30 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate for classifiers retrained with user specific data from Subject 8.....	208
Table 31 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate for classifiers retrained with user specific data from Subject 8.....	209
Table 32 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the retraining time for classifiers retrained with user specific data from Subject 8.....	209
Table 33 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the validation set real- time classification error rate for classifiers retrained with user specific data from Subject 9.....	209
Table 34 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate for classifiers retrained with user specific data from Subject 9.....	210
Table 35 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate for classifiers retrained with user specific data from Subject 9.....	210
Table 36 Friedman’s 2-way analysis of variance by ranks of the retraining time for classifiers retrained with user specific data from Subject 9.....	210
Table 37 Pairs of treatments with different ANN architectures having statistically significant differences in validation set real-time classification error rate	211
Table 38 Pairs of treatments trained using different algorithms having statistically significant differences in validation set real-time classification error rate	212
Table 39 Pairs of treatments trained with different training set size having statistically significant differences in validation set real-time classification error rate.....	212
Table 40 Pairs of treatments with different ANN architectures having statistically significant differences in training time	212
Table 41 Pairs of treatments trained using different algorithms having statistically significant differences in training time	219

Table 42 Pairs of treatments trained with different training set size having statistically significant differences in training time	219
Table 43 Pairs of treatments with different ANN architectures having statistically significant differences in Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate.	220
Table 44 Pairs of treatments trained using different algorithms having statistically significant differences in Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate.	221
Table 45 Pairs of treatments trained with different training set size having statistically significant differences in Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate	221
Table 46 Pairs of treatments with different ANN architectures having statistically significant differences in Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate.	221
Table 47 Pairs of treatments trained using different algorithms having statistically significant differences in Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate.	222
Table 48 Pairs of treatments trained with different training set size having statistically significant differences in Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate	223
Table 49 Pairs of treatments with different retraining procedure, adapted for Subject 8, having statistically significant differences in validation set real-time classification error rate	223
Table 50 Pairs of treatments with different retraining procedure, adapted for Subject 8, having statistically significant differences in Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate	223
Table 51 Pairs of treatments with different retraining procedure, adapted for Subject 8, having statistically significant differences in Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate	224
Table 52 Pairs of treatments with different retraining procedure, adapted for Subject 8, having statistically significant differences in retraining time	224
Table 53 Pairs of treatments with different retraining procedure, adapted for Subject 9, having statistically significant differences in validation set real-time classification error rate	225
Table 54 Pairs of treatments with different retraining procedure, adapted for Subject 9, having statistically significant differences in Subject 8 test set real-time classification error rate	225
Table 55 Pairs of treatments with different retraining procedure, adapted for Subject 9, having statistically significant differences in Subject 9 test set real-time classification error rate	225
Table 56 Pairs of treatments with different retraining procedure, adapted for Subject 9, having statistically significant differences in retraining time	226

Abstract

Assistive technology is increasingly being used to allow people with disabilities to be more engaged in personal, social and vocational activities. However, people with high-level disabilities are still affected by barriers to independence and full inclusion into broader society. The focus of this thesis is to advance the development of a wheelchair control system for highly disabled people, providing a means for satisfying some of the mobility needs of people who have difficulty or are unable to achieve mobility through existing assistive technologies.

A control system allowing hands-free wheelchair control is proposed, advancing from systems previously described in literature. The proposed control system allows the operation of a powered wheelchair by using an artificial neural network (ANN) classifier to recognize head gesture commands. The feasibility of this control system is tested on its ability to correctly recognise command gestures of both able-bodied and disabled people in real-time.

Techniques for improving the ability of the head gesture classifier to recognise gestures performed by people with disabilities are investigated. The effectiveness of these techniques is evaluated for highly disabled people. The effect of empirically selecting an optimal ANN architecture and training algorithm using training data from a general population is considered, as is the marginal benefit of additional training data from such a population. The benefit of adapting the classifier using data from the specific end user is investigated as a means of further improving performance.

While demonstrating the feasibility of the proposed control system, the results presented showed that the performance of the system was lower for people with disabilities than for able-bodied users. It was found that selection of the ANN architecture, training algorithm and training set size all had significant effects of some degree on the ability of the classifier component to recognise command gestures by people with disabilities in real time. It was also found that data from a specific end user to train the ANN can significantly improve classifier performance.

It was found that adapting the classifier ANN using a combination of user specific and generic data could improve the performance of the classifier for that end user while minimising or avoiding any reduction in classifier performance for other people. It was also found that retraining such an ANN with user specific data alone improves the performance of the classifier for that end user but is detrimental to the classification performance for other people.

Notation and terminology

Table 1 Terminology used throughout this thesis

Term	Definition
SCI	Spinal Cord Injury
ANN	Artificial Neural Network
Delta rule	A training algorithm for artificial neural networks, also known as the gradient descent (Hagan 1995) or backpropagation (Haykin 1999) algorithm.
Tetraplegia	Paralysis of all four limbs, also known as quadriplegia
Generic dataset	A set containing recorded gestures or input-output pairs observed from the data provided by a group of people.
Specific dataset	A set containing recorded gestures or input-output pairs observed from the data provided by a single, known person.
PWM	Pulse Width Modulation, a modulation scheme where duty cycle of a square-wave carrier encodes the signal.